

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/671,846	09/25/2003	Eugene George Olczak	133074-1	8697		
6147	7590 12/14/2005		EXAMINER			
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY			CHEVALIER, ALICIA ANN			
GLOBAL RESEARCH PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	A, NY 12309		1772			
			DATE MAIL ED. 12/14/200	DATE MAIL ED: 12/14/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No).	Applicant(s)	7			
		10/671,846		OLCZAK ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Alicia Chevalier		1772	<u></u>			
The MAILING D Period for Reply	ATE of this communication app	pears on the cov	er sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
THE MAILING DATE (- Extensions of time may be at after SIX (6) MONTHS from the lift the period for reply specifies. If NO period for reply is specifies. Failure to reply within the set	CUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' OF THIS COMMUNICATION. vailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 he mailing date of this communication. d above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl filed above, the maximum statutory period or extended period for reply will, by statute ice later than three months after the mailing nt. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, hor y within the statutory m will apply and will expire, cause the application	wever, may a reply be tim ninimum of thirty (30) days e SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	<i>r.</i> ommunication.			
Status								
1) Responsive to c	ommunication(s) filed on 23 N	lovember 2005.						
	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims	·		·					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/ 4a) Of the above 5) □ Claim(s) <u></u> 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/ 7) □ Claim(s) <u></u>	are rejected.	wn from conside						
Application Papers								
9) The specification	is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) fi	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
11) I he oath or decia	aration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note th	e attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119							
a) All b) Som 1. Certified company 2. Certified company 3. Copies of application	is made of a claim for foreign the * c) \sum None of: opies of the priority document opies of the priority document the certified copies of the priority from the International Bureau detailed Office action for a list	s have been rec s have been rec rity documents h u (PCT Rule 17.	eived. eived in Application nave been receive 2(a)).	on No d in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References Cited		4) 🗆	Interview Summary					
	atent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	· —	Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal Pa Other:		-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/671,846 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

Request for Continued Examination

- 1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.53 (d) filed on November 23, 2005 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
- 2. Claims 1-13 are pending in the application, claims 14-28 have been cancelled.
- 3. Amendments to the claims, filed on October 25, 2005, 2005, have been entered in the above-identified application.

REJECTIONS

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McGrath (U.S. Patent No. 4,025,159).

Regarding Applicant's claim 1, McGrath discloses a multiplayer optical film (cellular retroreflective sheeting, title). The film comprises at least two component films (bass sheet and cover film, col. 3, lines 25-26). At least one of the component films (bass sheet) has an upper and lower surface (figure 3). The upper surface comprises a series of optical structures (mircospheres, col. 3, line 33) and a plurality of raised spacing structures (narrow intersecting

Art Unit: 1772

bonds, col. 3, line 26). The lower surface is essentially planar (figure 3). The component films are joined so as to constitute a single structure comprising at least one gap disposed between the component films (figure 3).

Furthermore, the gap is deemed to be greater than the coherent length of light used to illuminate the optical film since the reference discloses that same height for the spacing structures as claimed by Applicant. See the discussion below regarding claim 7. Furthermore, Applicant's specification on page 7, paragraph [0020] recites that the gap between surfaces should be greater than the coherent length of the light source, typically no less than a few microns.

The preamble/limitation "backlighting display" is deemed to be a statement with regard to the intended use and is not further limiting in so far as the structure of the product is concerned. In article claims, a claimed intended use must result in a *structural difference* between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. MPEP § 2111.02.

Regarding Applicant's claims 2 and 3, McGrath discloses that the optical structures are convex and concave structures (*mircospheres*, col. 3, line 33 and figure 3).

Regarding Applicant's claim 4, McGrath discloses that the optical structures are prisms, since the reference discloses cube-corner elements can be interchangeable used with the microspheres (col. 6, lines 13-20 and figure 7).

Regarding Applicant's claims 5 and 6, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures comprise at least one post-structure and/or at least one beam structure (narrow intersection bonds, col. 3, line 26 and figures 1, 3 and 7).

Regarding Applicant's claim 7, McGrath discloses that the spacing structures have a height relative to the optical structures between about 0.1 and about 20 microns, since the reference shows in figure 3 that the spacing structure, i.e. narrow intersection bonds, have a height of half the diameter of the optical structures, i.e. microspheres, and the diameter of the microspheres is between 10 and 200 micrometers (*col. 5, lines 29-30*), which means that the height of the narrow intersection bonds is between 5 to 100 microns.

Regarding Applicant's claim 8, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures comprise at least one post-structure (narrow intersection bonds, col. 3, line 26 and figures 1, 3 and 7).

Regarding Applicant's claim 9, McGrath discloses that the component films have a thickness between about 0.006 and about 5 millimeters, since the reference discloses that the base sheet has a thickness of 75 micrometers (col. 6, lines60-61) and the cover film has a thickness between 1 and 5 mils (col. 5, line 14), which together have a thickness of 100.4-203 micrometers or 0.1 to 0.2 mm.

Regarding Applicant's claim 10, McGrath discloses that the gap comprises solid matter, fluid matter and combinations thereof, since the reference discloses that air, i.e. a fluid, in the gaps (col. 3, lines 23-30).

Regarding Applicant's claims 11 and 12, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures have either equal or unequal heights relative to the optical structures (figures 3 and 7).

Regarding Applicant's claim 13, figure 3 in McGrath shows that the raised spacing structures occupy an area, the area is deemed to define a percentage of a total area of the film

Art Unit: 1772

surface upon which the raised spacing structures are disposed. Furthermore, it can be seen from figure 1 that the percentage is in the range between about 1 and about 50.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments in the response filed October 25, 2005, 2005 regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 of record have been considered but are most due to the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Chevalier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1490. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

12/12/05

ALICIA CHEVALIER